

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE**

MARTA D. LYALL,

Plaintiff,

v.

U.S. BANK NATIONAL
ASSOCIATION; TRUMAN TITLE 2013
SC3 TITLE TRUST; TRUMAN
CAPITAL ADVISORS, LP;
RUSHMORE LOAN MANAGEMENT
SERVICES, LLC; BANK OF AMERICA,
N.A.; DITECH HOME LOAN
SERVICING; CWABS MASTER
TRUST, REVOLVING HOME EQUITY
LOAN ASSET BACKED NOTES,
SERIES 2004-"O"; CARNEGIE
MELLON UNIVERSITY; UNIVERSITY
OF WASHINGTON; WASHINGTON
STATE DEPARTMENT OF
COMMERCE; DISPUTE RESOLUTION
CENTER OF KING COUNTY; and
JOHN AND JANE DOES 1-100,

Defendants.

Case No: 17-00472-RAJ

ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff's recent letters regarding the pending motions to dismiss. Dkt. ## 149, 150. Plaintiff acknowledges receipt of Defendants' pending motions to dismiss. Dkt. ## 130, 131, 136, 144, 147. She seeks permission to file a single response, and she states that she will need twenty-one pages

per Defendant in her combined response. In addition, Plaintiff requests an extension of time to respond to the pending motions to dismiss.

Local Rule 7(e)(3) limits briefs in opposition to twenty-four pages. However, the Court permits Plaintiff to file one brief in opposition not to exceed forty-eight pages, addressing all pending motions to dismiss. In the alternative, Plaintiff may respond separately to each motion but will be limited to the twenty-four page limit set forth in the Local Rules.

Plaintiff's first response to Defendant's motion to dismiss (Dkt. # 131) is due January 16, 2018. The Court will grant Plaintiff an extension to respond to all pending motions to dismiss. Plaintiff may file her response(s) no later than Monday, February 12, 2018. Defendants' replies must be filed no later than Friday, February 16, 2018. The Court directs the Clerk to re-note the pending motions for February 16, 2018. Plaintiff's response(s) must abide by the page limits set forth above. The Court will not consider pages beyond these limits.

The Court acknowledges receipt of Plaintiff's additional requests, including her wish to reinstate certain Defendants and file pre-discovery motions. The Court DENIES these requests to the extent that Plaintiff is seeking to pursue discovery and motion practice outside the normal course of litigation. The Court will not make exceptions to the normal procedures at this time.

Plaintiff may pursue discovery and file discovery-related motions in the normal course of litigation. If Plaintiff wishes to file discovery-related motions, such as motions to compel, against current Defendants, she may do so. Plaintiff is warned that should she file contemporaneous motions—including duplicate motions with "corrections" as Plaintiff has done in the past—or litigate in a way that is detrimental to the case or this

Court's docket¹, the Court may consider limiting Plaintiff's ability to pursue discovery.

Dated this 10th day of January, 2018.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Richard A. Jones", written over a horizontal line.

The Honorable Richard A. Jones
United States District Judge

¹ The Court will remind Plaintiff that it has a low tolerance for violations of the Local Rules and Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.